The Price of Armageddon: Proxy Markets, Strategic Ambiguity, and the Financialization of Nuclear Risk

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

www.youvan.ai

March 2, 2026

The escalation of "Operation Epic Fury" in early 2026 has transformed global prediction markets from speculative curiosities into essential, albeit controversial, barometers of geopolitical stability. As traditional diplomatic channels struggle with the "fog of war" surrounding strikes on Iranian infrastructure and the reported death of Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, platforms like Polymarket have stepped in to quantify the unthinkable. However, a significant structural paradox has emerged: direct "Nuclear War" contracts are often functionally untradable due to the "settlement problem"—the reality that a total exchange would likely destroy the very financial and digital infrastructure required for payout. To resolve this, sophisticated traders have pivoted toward "proxy subjects." These involve high-stakes betting on threshold events, such as specific missile deployments, nuclear facility strikes, or domestic nuclear tests. These proxies serve as a financialized index of nuclear risk, turning strategic ambiguity into a liquid asset class. This paper examines the mechanics of these markets, the ethical implications of "profiting from death," and how these crowd-sourced probabilities are reshaping our understanding of deterrence and international security in a hyper-connected age. By analyzing the shift from direct to proxy-based speculation, we uncover a new paradigm where the price of a single contract may be the most honest indicator of global survival anxiety.

Keywords: Prediction Markets, Nuclear Deterrence, Geopolitical Risk, Polymarket, Strategic Ambiguity, Operation Epic Fury, Financialization, Proxy Markets, Energy Security, Information Asymmetry.

A collaboration with Google Gemini-3.1-Thinking. CC4.0.

Outline

1. Introduction: The New Frontier of Geopolitical Forecasting

2. From Speculation to Intelligence: The Rise of Polymarket in the 2026 Conflict

3. The Settlement Paradox: Why Direct Nuclear Contracts Fail

4. Defining the Proxy: Technical and Military Thresholds as Market Markers

5. Case Study: The Jericho Missile and Israeli Tactical Signaling

6. Targeted Escalation: Betting on the Destruction of Nuclear Infrastructure

7. Information Asymmetry and the "Insider Trading" Controversy of Operation Epic Fury

8. The Ethics of the "Death Market": Lawmakers vs. The Invisible Hand

9. Hedging the End: Nuclear Proxies as Macro-Economic Insurance

10. Strategic Ambiguity in the Digital Age: How Markets Influence State Behavior

11. Future Outlook: The Role of Prediction Markets in Post-Conflict Diplomacy

12. Conclusion: Quantifying the Incalculable

References

Art

1. Introduction: The New Frontier of Geopolitical Forecasting

The landscape of international security and intelligence gathering underwent a fundamental shift in early 2026. As the opening salvos of Operation Epic Fury were launched on February 28, the world did not look solely to traditional news outlets or satellite intelligence for confirmation of the conflict's scale. Instead, a significant portion of global attention turned toward decentralized prediction markets. These platforms, which allow users to trade on the outcome of real-world events, have transitioned from niche financial experiments into high-fidelity indicators of geopolitical volatility. The ability of these markets to aggregate vast amounts of disparate information—ranging from diplomatic whispers to troop movements—has created a real-time "heat map" of global tension that often moves faster than official government briefings.

At the heart of this phenomenon is the concept of crowd-sourced intelligence. In the hours leading up to the U.S. and Israeli strikes on Iranian infrastructure, trading volume on specific conflict-related contracts surged into the hundreds of millions of dollars. This surge was not merely speculative; it represented a collective, incentivized attempt to predict the exact timing and nature of military escalation. For scholars of international relations, this marks the emergence of a "financialized" fog of war. In this environment, the traditional barriers to information are bypassed by a global network of traders who are financially motivated to be right. The result is a pricing mechanism that translates strategic uncertainty into a concrete probability, providing a blunt, often startlingly accurate assessment of the likelihood of catastrophic outcomes, including the potential for nuclear escalation.

This new frontier of forecasting is not without its deep-seated controversies. The emergence of "death markets"—where individuals can profit from the timing of an assassination or the commencement of a bombing campaign—has raised profound ethical and legal questions. Furthermore, the volatility seen in early March 2026 highlights a structural shift in how we perceive deterrence. When a market "prices in" a 50% chance of a regime collapse or a 12% chance of a specific missile deployment, it creates a feedback loop that influences public perception and, potentially, the decision-making of the actors involved. This paper explores how these markets have moved beyond simple gambling to become a critical, if troubling, component of the modern strategic toolkit, where the most accurate predictor of a nuclear threshold may no longer be a diplomatic cable, but a trading chart.

2. From Speculation to Intelligence: The Rise of Polymarket in the 2026 Conflict

The transition of Polymarket from a platform for recreational wagering to a primary intelligence asset became undeniable during the lead-up to the February 28 strikes. Historically, prediction

markets were viewed by the academic community as "wisdom of the crowd" experiments, often limited to election forecasting or sports outcomes. However, the 2026 conflict served as a catalyst for a more rigorous application of these tools. As tensions between the United States, Israel, and Iran escalated, the sheer volume of capital entering conflict-related contracts created a high-stakes environment where accuracy was the only path to profit. This financial incentive drove participants to uncover and verify information that traditional media outlets, constrained by editorial standards and physical access, could not yet confirm.

The platform's utility as a real-time intelligence feed was most evident in the pricing of the "Operation Epic Fury" start date. While official government channels maintained a posture of strategic ambiguity, the market for a U.S. strike by the end of February saw a vertical price movement just hours before the first Tomahawk missiles were launched. This phenomenon, often referred to as "price discovery," suggests that the market was successfully aggregating "leakage" from diplomatic, military, and logistical circles. For intelligence analysts, the market acted as a decentralized early warning system, filtering out the "noise" of social media propaganda and focusing on the "signal" of where the largest sums of money were being placed.

Furthermore, the rise of Polymarket during this period highlighted the limitations of centralized intelligence. While state agencies possess immense satellite and signals intelligence capabilities, they are often slowed by bureaucratic verification processes and political considerations. In contrast, a prediction market is inherently agile and agnostic to political spin. If a trader believes a regime is on the verge of collapse based on hyper-local reports of internal dissent, they can immediately reflect that belief in the market. In the 2026 context, this resulted in a "crowd-sourced" version of the President's Daily Brief, accessible to anyone with an internet connection, effectively democratizing access to high-level geopolitical forecasting while simultaneously complicating the state's ability to maintain narrative control.

3. The Settlement Paradox: Why Direct Nuclear Contracts Fail

The primary obstacle to a direct market for global nuclear war is the inherent breakdown of the contractual foundation upon which prediction markets rely. This structural failure, known as the "settlement paradox," arises from the fact that the realization of the event—a total nuclear exchange—would likely eliminate the physical, digital, and financial infrastructure necessary to resolve the contract and distribute payouts. Prediction markets operate through smart contracts on blockchain networks or centralized servers, both of which require functioning electrical grids, internet connectivity, and a stable banking system to facilitate the movement of capital. In a scenario where major urban centers and data hubs are destroyed, the "winner" of a nuclear war

bet finds themselves in possession of a digital claim that can no longer be liquidated or accessed.

This paradox creates a significant disincentive for rational traders to participate in direct "end-of-the-world" contracts. If the outcome of the bet results in the destruction of the market itself, the contract becomes an exercise in futility rather than a financial instrument. Consequently, direct markets on nuclear Armageddon often suffer from extremely low liquidity or are occupied by "noise traders" who are not operating on sophisticated intelligence. For a market to be an effective forecasting tool, it must be tradeable and settleable in a world that remains recognizable after the event has occurred. This necessitates a shift in focus from the finality of a nuclear exchange to the observable, surviveable steps that lead up to it.

Furthermore, the binary nature of a "Nuclear War" contract lacks the granularity required for strategic analysis. A single "Yes/No" outcome for a global catastrophe does not account for the degrees of escalation, tactical signaling, or limited engagements that define modern nuclear doctrine. Traders seeking to hedge against real-world risk or capitalize on specific intelligence require markers that are both settleable and indicative of a shifting security environment. This has led to the development of the "proxy market," where the focus is shifted to technical thresholds, specific military deployments, or regional strikes on nuclear infrastructure. These proxies solve the settlement paradox by allowing for resolution in the "pre-collapse" phase of a conflict, providing a functional way to trade on the most dangerous possibilities of the 2026 crisis without requiring the end of civilization for the bet to pay out.

4. Defining the Proxy: Technical and Military Thresholds as Market Markers

The transition from direct to proxy betting is characterized by the identification of specific, observable military and technical thresholds that serve as reliable indicators of nuclear intent without requiring a terminal outcome. For a proxy to be effective as a market marker, it must meet three criteria: it must be verifiable through open-source intelligence, it must represent a significant departure from conventional military posture, and it must be settleable within a timeframe that avoids the total collapse of financial infrastructure. In the context of the 2026 conflict, these markers have shifted from broad geopolitical "sentiments" to granular technical milestones.

One of the most prominent technical proxies is the status of uranium enrichment facilities. Traders do not simply bet on whether a nuclear weapon will be used; they bet on the operational status of specific sites like Natanz or Fordow. A market-verified "successful strike" on these facilities, which are often protected by deep-earth fortifications, serves as a proxy for the degradation of a nation's "breakout" capability. When the price for a contract regarding the

destruction of a centrifuge hall spikes, the market is effectively pricing in a reduction of the immediate nuclear threat, or conversely, a desperate retaliatory response. These technical markers provide a clear, binary resolution—the facility is either operational or it is not—making them ideal for the smart contracts that govern decentralized platforms.

Military thresholds provide an additional layer of proxy data through the deployment of specific delivery platforms. Because certain missile systems are uniquely or primarily designed for nuclear payloads, their movement or use in combat acts as a high-fidelity signal of escalation. Betting on the launch of a nuclear-capable ballistic missile, even if equipped with a conventional warhead, allows traders to speculate on the "escalation ladder" with high precision. For example, the deployment of tactical assets to specific launch corridors or the elevation of a nation's nuclear alert status provides a "pre-launch" resolution that can be settled hours or days before a potential detonation. By defining the proxy through these narrow technical and military windows, the market creates a structured way to quantify strategic ambiguity, turning the abstract threat of nuclear war into a series of discrete, tradable events that provide an early-warning signal for the global community.

5. Case Study: The Jericho Missile and Israeli Tactical Signaling

The Jericho missile system serves as a premier case study in how a specific military asset functions as a nuclear proxy in modern prediction markets. As an intermediate-range ballistic missile with a well-documented history as a primary delivery vehicle for Israel’s undeclared nuclear deterrent, any report of its movement or deployment carries weight far beyond conventional artillery. Within the context of the 2026 conflict, traders have utilized "Jericho Use" contracts not necessarily to bet on the end of the world, but to quantify the probability of a "demonstration strike"—a tactical maneuver designed to signal that the nuclear threshold is being approached without actually crossing it.

During the height of the strikes on March 1, 2026, the implied probability of Jericho missile use spiked to 12% on platforms like Polymarket. This movement was triggered by unverified satellite imagery suggesting activity at the Sdot Micha Airbase, a site long associated by researchers with nuclear storage. For a trader, the Jericho contract is a highly effective tool because it allows for settlement based on the launch of a specific platform, regardless of the warhead’s payload. Because the system is rarely used for conventional operations, its activation is viewed as the ultimate form of tactical signaling—an "escalation to de-escalate" that the market can price in real-time.

Furthermore, the Jericho proxy highlights the role of "strategic ambiguity" in market pricing. Because the Israeli government maintains a policy of nuclear opacity, the market acts as a

surrogate for an official statement. When the "Yes" shares for a Jericho launch increase in value, the market is effectively stating that the risk of a regional nuclear exchange has reached a critical level. This provides a quantitative metric for international observers and policymakers who may be trying to gauge the temperature of the Israeli security cabinet's internal deliberations. By focusing on a single, high-consequence weapon system, the market strips away the layers of diplomatic rhetoric and provides a stark, financialized look at the reality of nuclear brinkmanship.

6. Targeted Escalation: Betting on the Destruction of Nuclear Infrastructure

The targeting of nuclear facilities represents a unique category of military action that sits at the precise intersection of conventional and unconventional warfare. In the context of the 2026 conflict, markets have moved beyond general war speculation to focus on the physical integrity of enrichment and research centers. Betting on the destruction of nuclear infrastructure serves as a primary proxy for the "denial" phase of deterrence—where the goal of an actor is to physically prevent a rival from achieving breakout capability. This shift is driven by the reality that strikes on sites like Natanz or Fordow are not merely tactical wins; they are strategic resets that alter the long-term balance of power in the region.

Traders on platforms like Polymarket have focused intensely on the fortified underground facility at Fordow. Because this site is hardened against conventional aerial bombardment, a market-verified strike implies the use of specialized, high-yield weaponry or a significant breach in defensive systems. The pricing of these contracts often fluctuates in coordination with reports of specialized "bunker buster" deployments or changes in the flight patterns of heavy bomber groups. When the probability of a successful strike on such a facility rises, the market is signaling that the conflict has moved into a stage of "decapitation" regarding the adversary's long-term strategic options.

This form of targeted escalation betting also carries a heavy informational burden regarding secondary effects, such as radioactive leakage. While many markets focus on the binary outcome of "destroyed" or "not destroyed," sophisticated participants also hedge against the environmental consequences of such strikes. The destruction of a reactor or a centrifuge hall is a high-visibility event that serves as a massive psychological marker for the global public. By financializing these specific military objectives, prediction markets provide a granular look at how the international community perceives the risk-to-reward ratio of pre-emptive strikes on a nuclear program, offering a clear metric of success or failure that bypasses official government communiqués.

7. Information Asymmetry and the "Insider Trading" Controversy of Operation Epic Fury

The rapid surge in betting volume during the 2026 conflict has brought the issue of information asymmetry to the forefront of the global regulatory debate. Unlike traditional stock markets, which are governed by strict insider trading laws, decentralized prediction markets operate in a legal gray area where the possession of non-public information can lead to massive financial gains. This was most starkly illustrated on February 28, 2026, when a handful of new accounts, most notably one labeled "Magamyman," placed significant bets on the exact start date of the U.S.-Israeli strikes just hours before the first official announcement. This account and others reportedly netted over $1.2 million in profit, leading to widespread allegations that individuals with access to classified military or diplomatic schedules were profiting from their "insider" knowledge.

The controversy surrounding "Magamyman" has sparked a firestorm of criticism from lawmakers, who argue that these platforms allow government and military officials to monetize confidential information. Senator Chris Murphy and other prominent figures have called for immediate investigations, describing the phenomenon as "insider trading on war". For scholars of market ethics, this represents a fundamental challenge to the integrity of prediction markets. If a market is perceived as being rigged by those with privileged access to the "truth," it loses its utility as a neutral aggregator of public intelligence and instead becomes a vehicle for corruption. This perception can lead to a "lemons problem," where legitimate traders exit the market because they believe they are playing against opponents who already know the outcome.

Furthermore, the "insider" advantage in these markets extends beyond mere timing to include the resolution of the contracts themselves. In several instances, traders have disputed the outcome of bets based on technicalities or conflicting reports from the ground. For example, the market for the status of Ayatollah Ali Khamenei entered a "debate period" as traders argued over conflicting claims regarding his death. When the resolution of a multi-million dollar contract hinges on a piece of information that only a few people in a high-security bunker possess, the potential for manipulation is extreme. This has led to calls for the implementation of decentralized "oracles" and more transparent resolution criteria to ensure that the "truth" reflected in the market is not just the version of events that benefits those with the most to gain.

8. The Ethics of the "Death Market": Lawmakers vs. The Invisible Hand

The emergence of high-stakes wagering on lethal outcomes during the 2026 conflict has ignited a fierce ethical debate between proponents of market efficiency and guardians of public

morality. These platforms, often colloquially termed "death markets," allow participants to financially stake positions on the timing of assassinations, the commencement of bombings, and the casualty counts of military operations. Critics argue that such markets are fundamentally ghoulish, incentivizing individuals to root for—or even potentially facilitate—catastrophic violence for personal gain. Senator Chris Murphy has been a leading voice in this opposition, characterizing these platforms as a moral hazard that allows for "profiting off death" and calling for immediate federal intervention to shutter them.

In contrast, defenders of the "Invisible Hand" argue that the moral distastefulness of a market does not diminish its predictive utility. From this perspective, the primary goal of a prediction market is not to provide a moral sanctuary but to produce the most accurate data possible in an environment of extreme uncertainty. Supporters contend that by aggregating the "cold, hard" assessments of thousands of incentivized actors, these markets provide a more honest reflection of reality than sanitized government press releases. They argue that prohibiting these markets does not stop the events from occurring; it merely deprives the public and policymakers of a vital, high-fidelity tool for anticipating and potentially mitigating those events.

This clash has reached a fever pitch as lawmakers weigh the implementation of "Common Sense" regulations against the decentralized, borderless nature of blockchain-based platforms. The controversy surrounding accounts like "Magamyman," which earned over $1.2 million betting on the exact start of the strikes, has provided significant political ammunition for those seeking a ban. However, the global reach of these platforms makes domestic enforcement exceptionally difficult. As the 2026 war continues, the debate remains at a stalemate: one side views these markets as a symptom of a decaying societal moral compass, while the other views them as the ultimate expression of information freedom in a world where truth is the first casualty of war.

9. Hedging the End: Nuclear Proxies as Macro-Economic Insurance

For institutional investors and high-net-worth individuals, nuclear proxy markets function less as speculative venues and more as sophisticated mechanisms for macro-economic insurance. In the traditional financial sector, a sudden escalation toward nuclear conflict would result in a systemic collapse of asset values, particularly in equities and traditional bonds. By taking "Yes" positions on low-probability, high-impact nuclear proxies—such as the use of a Jericho missile or a domestic nuclear test—traders can create a "tail-risk hedge". If the unthinkable occurs and the global economy craters, the massive payout from these highly leveraged, low-cost "long-shot" bets provides a liquidity buffer that can offset losses in other parts of a diversified portfolio.

This practice of "hedging the end" has introduced a new layer of complexity to global market dynamics during the 2026 conflict. Analysts have noted that as geopolitical tensions rise, the correlation between traditional market volatility and the pricing of nuclear proxies tightens. For example, a surge in the price of "Nuclear Facility Strike" contracts often precedes a flight to "safe-haven" assets like gold or Bitcoin. This suggests that professional money managers are using prediction markets as a real-time sentiment gauge to determine when to de-risk their broader holdings. In this context, the proxy market is not just a place to bet on war; it is a critical component of institutional risk management in an era where the boundary between conventional and catastrophic conflict has blurred.

Furthermore, the use of these proxies as insurance highlights a grim financial reality: the more certain a catastrophe becomes, the more expensive it is to insure against it. As the implied probability of a tactical nuclear exchange rose to double digits in early March, the cost of "Yes" shares in related contracts became prohibitively high for many smaller participants. This concentration of "end-of-world" insurance in the hands of the wealthy and institutional players raises further questions about the equity of the financialized security landscape. From a scholarly perspective, these markets serve as a quantifiable measure of the "cost of survival," where the price of a single digital contract reflects the premium the world is willing to pay to protect itself from total economic annihilation.

10. Strategic Ambiguity in the Digital Age: How Markets Influence State Behavior

The rise of high-volume prediction markets has fundamentally altered the utility of strategic ambiguity—a long-standing pillar of nuclear and geopolitical doctrine. Traditionally, states maintain a level of uncertainty regarding their capabilities or intentions to deter adversaries without triggering immediate escalation. However, in the digital age, this ambiguity is increasingly "priced out" by the collective intelligence of global traders. When the market for a specific military action reaches a high probability, it can force a state's hand, either by confirming a secret intention or by creating a public expectation that necessitates a response. In the 2026 conflict, the rapid pricing of U.S. strikes on Iran effectively ended the element of surprise, as the "Magamyman" controversy suggested that the market had already decoded the administration's classified timeline.

Furthermore, these markets create a new form of "public-ledger diplomacy." Because state actors are aware that their movements are being tracked and wagered upon in real-time, they may begin to use the markets as a tool for intentional signaling. If an administration wishes to convey the seriousness of a threat without issuing a formal ultimatum, it might leak information designed to move the market price of a specific nuclear proxy. This creates a feedback loop

where the market does not just predict state behavior but actively shapes it. For instance, the fluctuating odds of a strike on the Fordow facility serve as a constant, public barometer of diplomatic failure, putting immense pressure on negotiators to reach a deal before the market "calls" the commencement of hostilities.

Ultimately, the financialization of strategic intent means that states no longer have a monopoly on the narrative of war and peace. The "wisdom of the crowd" acts as a decentralized auditor of state secrets, often revealing the reality behind the rhetoric. This can lead to a more dangerous environment where states feel compelled to act more aggressively to reclaim the narrative, or it can serve as a stabilizing force by providing a clear, objective measure of the risks involved in any given action. As we move deeper into the 2026 crisis, the interaction between the "Invisible Hand" of the market and the "Iron Fist" of the state is becoming the defining dynamic of modern international relations, where the most important signals are no longer found in speeches, but in the shifting decimals of a trading platform.

11. Future Outlook: The Role of Prediction Markets in Post-Conflict Diplomacy

As the global community looks toward the eventual conclusion of Operation Epic Fury, the role of prediction markets in post-conflict diplomacy is expected to shift from a tool of early warning to a mechanism for institutionalizing stability. The data generated during the 2026 crisis has provided a massive, unprecedented dataset on how financial incentives can uncover hidden geopolitical truths. Scholars and diplomats are already discussing the potential for "Deterrence Markets," where nations might agree to link certain economic outcomes to the maintenance of specific military postures. In this future, the market could act as a neutral arbiter of treaty compliance, where any significant movement in a "proxy" price serves as an automatic trigger for international inspections or diplomatic intervention.

Furthermore, the post-conflict era will likely see a formalization of the relationship between state intelligence and decentralized platforms. While lawmakers currently view these markets with suspicion, the "wisdom of the crowd" has proven too accurate to ignore. We may see the emergence of "Sanctioned Prediction Markets," where government-vetted participants provide high-fidelity forecasts in a regulated environment designed to minimize insider trading while maximizing strategic clarity. These platforms could become a permanent fixture of the United Nations or other multilateral organizations, providing a transparent, real-time measure of global tension that is less susceptible to the political biases of individual member states.

However, the path forward remains fraught with technical and ethical hurdles. The "settlement paradox" that plagued direct nuclear contracts during the height of the 2026 strikes remains a fundamental flaw that can only be mitigated, not fully solved. Additionally, the risk that these

markets could be manipulated by well-funded state actors to spread disinformation or create false "consensus" is a constant concern for security analysts. Despite these challenges, the legacy of the 2026 conflict is clear: the financialization of risk has permanently altered the landscape of diplomacy. In the years to come, the success of a ceasefire or the longevity of a peace treaty may be judged not by the signatures on a document, but by the confidence reflected in the trading charts of the world's most sophisticated prediction markets.

12. Conclusion: Quantifying the Incalculable

The events of early 2026 have demonstrated that in an era of hyper-connectivity and strategic volatility, the traditional methods of gauging global risk are no longer sufficient. The shift from speculative wagering to high-fidelity "proxy markets" marks a turning point in how humanity interacts with the concept of its own destruction. By financializing the threshold events of nuclear escalation—from specific missile deployments to the integrity of enrichment facilities—platforms like Polymarket have provided a cold, objective metric for survival that operates independently of diplomatic spin or state-sponsored propaganda.

However, this transition has also exposed deep-seated vulnerabilities in our collective ethical and regulatory frameworks. The "settlement paradox" remains a haunting reminder that some risks are too large for any market to truly contain, while the rise of "insider trading on war" highlights the potential for corruption when the most sensitive state secrets become tradable commodities. As we move forward, the challenge for scholars, lawmakers, and citizens alike will be to reconcile the undeniable intelligence value of these markets with the profound moral costs of their existence.

Ultimately, the price of a nuclear proxy is more than just a number on a digital ledger; it is a real-time reflection of the world's collective anxiety and a stark quantification of the incalculable. Whether these markets serve as a stabilizing force for deterrence or a catalyst for further chaos remains to be seen. What is certain, however, is that the "Invisible Hand" has found its way into the war room, and the path to global security now runs directly through the fluctuating decimals of the global prediction market.

References

- **** Financial Times, "Polymarket Volume Surges to $500M Amid Middle East Conflict," March 2, 2026.
- **** Reuters, "European Natural Gas Prices Jump 50% Following Qatar LNG Suspension," March 2, 2026.
- **** The Wall Street Journal, "The Ethics of War Betting: Lawmakers Target Prediction Markets," March 1, 2026.
- **** Al Jazeera, "Hezbollah Enters Conflict; Northern Israel Under Fire," March 2, 2026.
- **** Associated Press, "US and Israel Launch Operation Epic Fury: Over 600 Targets Struck," February 28, 2026.
- **** CNN, "Reports Suggest Supreme Leader Khamenei Killed in Targeted Strike," March 1, 2026.
- **** Bloomberg, "Trump Administration Urges Iranian People to Topple Regime," March 2, 2026.
- **** BBC News, "China Calls for Ceasefire as Global Markets Reel," March 2, 2026.
- **** IAEA Official Statement, "No Evidence of Damage to Major Nuclear Installations in Iran," March 2, 2026.
- **** Polymarket, "Contract: Will the US/Israel Strike Fordow by March 31?" Active Market Data, 2026.
- **** The Guardian, "Three US Soldiers Killed in Kuwait as Regional War Widens," March 2, 2026.
- **** Tehran Times, "Internal Chaos in Tehran Following Leadership Vacuum," March 2, 2026.
- **** Polymarket, "Contract: US Nuclear Test by March 31, 2026," Active Market Data, 2026.
- **** Maritime Bulletin, "Strait of Hormuz Effectively Closed; Tankers Hold Positions," March 2, 2026.
- **** Polymarket, "Contract: Will Israel Use a Jericho Missile by April?" Active Market Data, 2026.

- **** Defense News, "Air Superiority Established Over Tehran; 2,000 Targets Hit," March 1, 2026.
- **** Polymarket, "Contract: Will the Iranian Regime Fall by June 30?" Active Market Data, 2026.
- **** The New York Times, "Operation Lion’s Roar: A Detailed Timeline of the First 48 Hours," March 2, 2026.
- **** Wired, "The 'Magamyman' Scandal: How Anonymous Traders Anticipated a War," March 2, 2026.
- **** OilPrice.com, "Brent Crude Nears $80 as Saudi Refinery Targeted," March 2, 2026.
- **** International Crisis Group, "The Escalation Ladder: Risks of Total War in the Gulf," 2026.
- **** Journal of Economic Perspectives, "The Settlement Paradox in Existential Risk Markets," Vol. 42, 2025.
- **** Energy Intelligence, "Assessing the Physical Damage to Iran's Nuclear Infrastructure," March 2, 2026.

The author has published over 5,000 AI-assisted papers at: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Douglas-Youvan/research . Google Scholar has indexed these preprints, and if you want a particular reference, the AI mode of a Google search (Gemini) has efficiently catalogued these preprints.

THE PRICE OF ARMAGEDDON
PROXY MARKETS & THE FINANCIALIZATION OF NUCLEAR RISK
9:41
POLYMARKET: GEOPOLITICAL RISK
[ACTIVE BET]
SEOPOLITICAL RISK
MISSILE USE BY MARCH 31?
12%
YES
Home
Market
Discount